AO 472 (Rev. 3/86) Order of Detention Pending Trial

| | ~ | _ | 2000 | = |
|-----|---|---|------|---|
| MΑY | 2 | 4 | 2006 | |
| | | | | M |

| WESTERN District of LOUISIANA UNITED STATES OF AMERICA V. ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL MIGUEL ANGEL MENDEZ Case Number: CR-06-60036 In accordance with the Bail Reform Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f), a detention hearing has been held. I conclude that the following facts require detention of the defendant pending trial in this case. Part I—Findings of Fact (1) The defendant is charged with an offense described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1) and has been convicted of a federal offense or local offense that would have been a federal offense if a circumstance giving rise to federal jurisdiction had existed that is a crime of violence as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 3156(a)(4). an offense for which the maximum sentence is life imprisonment or death. an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in |
|--|
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA V. ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL MIGUEL ANGEL MENDEZ Defendant In accordance with the Bail Reform Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f), a detention hearing has been held. I conclude that the following facts require detention of the defendant pending trial in this case. Part I—Findings of Fact (1) The defendant is charged with an offense described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1) and has been convicted of a federal offense or local offense that would have been a federal offense if a circumstance giving rise to federal jurisdiction had existed that is a offense for which the maximum sentence is life imprisonment or death |
| MIGUEL ANGEL MENDEZ Defendant In accordance with the Bail Reform Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f), a detention hearing has been held. I conclude that the following facts require detention of the defendant pending trial in this case. Part I—Findings of Fact (1) The defendant is charged with an offense described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1) and has been convicted of a federal offense or local offense that would have been a federal offense if a circumstance giving rise to federal jurisdiction had existed that is an offense for which the maximum sentence is life imprisonment or death |
| Case Number: CR-06-60036 Defendant In accordance with the Bail Reform Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f), a detention hearing has been held. I conclude that the following facts require detention of the defendant pending trial in this case. Part I—Findings of Fact (1) The defendant is charged with an offense described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1) and has been convicted of a federal offense or local offense that would have been a federal offense if a circumstance giving rise to federal jurisdiction had existed that is an offense for which the maximum sentence is life imprisonment or death |
| Part I—Findings of Fact (1) The defendant is charged with an offense described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1) and has been convicted of a federal offense a crime of violence as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 3156(a)(4). an offense for which the maximum sentence is life imprisonment or death |
| or local offense that would have been a federal offense if a circumstance giving rise to federal jurisdiction had existed that is a crime of violence as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 3156(a)(4). an offense for which the maximum sentence is life imprisonment or death |
| |
| a felony that was committed after the defendant had been convicted of two or more prior federal offenses described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1)(A)-(C), or comparable state or local offenses. (2) The offense described in finding (1) was committed while the defendant was on release pending trial for a federal, state or local offense for the offense described in finding (1). (3) A period of not more than five years has elapsed since the date of conviction release of the defendant from imprisonment for the offense described in finding (1). (4) Findings Nos. (1), (2) and (3) establish a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of (an) other person(s) and the community. I further find that the defendant has not rebutted this presumption. |
| Alternative Findings (A) [1] There is probable cause to believe that the different formula is a second of the control of the |
| for which a maximum term of imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c). [2] The defendant has not rebutted the presumption established by finding 1 that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably asset the appearance of the defendant as required and the safety of the community. |
| Alternative Findings (D) |
| X (1) There is a serious risk that the defendant will not appear. (2) There is a serious risk that the defendant will endanger the safety of another person or the community. |
| Part II—Written Statement of Reasons for Detention I find that the credible testimony and information submitted at the hearing establishes by clear and convincing evidence x a preponderance of the evidence that defendant is not entitled to release under the Bail Reform Act. Defendant is charged in an indictment with illegal entry following deportation. Defendant is a citizen of Mexico and is in the United States illegally. There is a detainer lodged against defendant by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) preventing defendant's physical release from custody. Defendant waived a detention hearing for this reason. Defendant is unmarried. His parents and five sisters live in Mexico. He was deported to Mexico in July of U. S. For the foregoing reasons, the court concludes defendant is a risk of flight. Defendant reserves the right to request a detention hearing in the future in the event the ICE detainer is lifted. |
| |
| Part III—Directions Regarding Detention The defendant is committed to the curtain Science of the Control of th |
| facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. The States or on request of an attorney for the Government than a correction with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United |
| United States marshal for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding. May 24, 2006 Date Signature of Judicial Officer MILDRED E. METHVIN, UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE |

*Insert as applicable: (a) Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. § 801 et seq.); (b) Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. § 951 et seq.); or (c) Section 1 of Act of Sept. 15, 1980 (21 U.S.C. § 955a).